



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

interested readers, I would not see it take a different course from that which its editor has so clearly outlined. This "newer" criticism presents itself not to a few scholars simply, but through cheap literature, crude newspaper discussions, and still more ill-advised sermons, it obtrudes itself on the attention of almost every man who reads at all. Our religious weeklies are not proper vehicles for the free discussion of these views. These papers enter almost every Christian home, and should serve, as indeed they do, to counteract the evil effects of a popular presentation of these views elsewhere. But surely *THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT* is just the place for such discussion. It reaches only a class of readers who are already acquainted with the "results" of recent criticism; who have already in a large majority of instances read more of its literature than *THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT* will publish in many a year; and who, moreover, are in a position to judge somewhat for themselves as to the validity of these "results." Or, if not able to do this, they are with few exceptions readers who have sense enough to suspend judgment until the critics themselves show some unmistakable signs of arriving at harmonious conclusions. I may not agree with the results set forth in a "radical" article. Indeed, I would probably disagree with them *in toto*, and yet be much interested in reading the views set forth. We have no reason to shrink from the discussion of these views, where such discussion is proper. God's word is abundantly able to take care of itself. We have seen similar attacks, conceived in the same spirit, made on the integrity of the New Testament. There has been a great flourish of trumpets, and many a man's heart has "trembled for the ark;" but the result has always been the same. The theories have been hopelessly exploded before their authors died, and the integrity of God's word has stood out clearer than ever before. To make *THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT* a journal for free discussion, and to make it an "organ" for rationalistic and destructive criticism are two things entirely distinct. The former I welcome; the latter I should deplore.

P. A. NORDELL,

New London, Conn.

---

## ➤BOOK NOTICES.◀

---

### KAMPHAUSEN'S HEBREW CHRONOLOGY.\*

---

Wellhausen, Stade and W. Robertson Smith agree in finding the Chronology of the book of Kings an artificial system and so generally untrustworthy. According to their theory the endeavor was made to divide the history of Israel from the Exodus to the return from the Captivity into two periods of 480 years each, the dividing line being the building of the Temple (1 Kgs. vi., 1). Each of these periods would naturally fall into twelve generations of 40 years each. It is assumed, therefore, that the years assigned to each king are modified so as to conform to this scheme. And in fact the importance of the number 40 in biblical history is obvious to the most superficial reader. That its frequent recurrence is not necessarily a proof that it rests only on artificial composition or on arbitrary alteration by the editors, is proved by Kamphausen in his recent essay on the subject.

Kamphausen carries out the process of playing with numbers in order to show that we may discover "artificial schemes" in any series of dates. The Hohenzollern family, for example, have special reason to remember the years 1640, 1740, 1840—evidently the number 40 has influenced German annalists! French history

---

\* *DIE CHRONOLOGIE DER HEBRAEISCHEN KOENIGE*. Eine geschichtliche Untersuchung von ADOLF KAMPHAUSEN, Dr. und ordentl. Prof. der Theologie in Bonn. Bonn, 1383. 104 pages octavo. A summary is to be found in Stade's *Zeitschrift fuer die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1883, pp. 193-202.

is equally artificial. The first five Bourbons reigned 203 years ( $2+3=5$ , the number of monarchs)—here also we have in round numbers five periods of 40 years. The number 12, however, is more prominent in the later chronology.

The Republic.....	1792-1804.....	(12 years).
The Empire.....	1804-1814.....	(10 years).
Louis XVIII.....	1814-1824.....	(10 years).
Charles X.....	1824-1830.....	( 6 years).
Louis Phillippe.....	1830-1848.....	(18 years).
The Republic.....	1848-1852.....	( 4 years).
Napoleon III.....	1852-1870.....	(18 years).

Here we notice one 12, two 18 (= one and a half times 12), one 6 (half 12) one 4 (third of 12) and the other two were made 10 (nearly 12) so as not to awaken suspicion by too great regularity! These two irregular numbers taken together with the irregular number (4) make 24 or twice twelve. Who can doubt if we had such a series in the Bible it would have been characterized as the result of an artificial system?

The evident result of this showing must be to discredit the ingenious discoverers of schemes of chronology. If a series of numbers which stand in the full light of history submit readily to such play, we shall hardly have much faith in the play as an argument against any other series. This sort of refutation does not, however, directly prove anything regarding the biblical dates, or remove the difficulties in Hebrew chronology. That there are difficulties as yet unsolved and that they are increased rather than diminished by the Assyrian Eponym lists may be taken as pretty well known. After his preliminary computation of the theory of schematization therefore Kamphausen addresses himself to the serious problem. He begins by noting the following fact: the author of our book of Kings refers his readers often to the book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel and the book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah. It follows that he knew his data might be compared by any reader with the data of these official Chronicles. It is hardly probable, therefore, that he would have changed the dates he gives and so have laid himself open to the charge of falsification.

We cannot go over in detail Kamphausen's examination of the numbers in the book of Kings, but will append his table of dates.

Saul Reigned B. C.....	1037-1018.	
David in Judah.....	1017-1011.	
David over all Israel.....	1010- 978.	
Rehoboam.....	937-921.	Jeroboam I.....937-916.
Abia.....	920-918.	Nadab.....915-914.
Asa.....	917-877.	Baasha.....914-891.
		Ela.....891-890.
		Zimri.....890.
		Omri.....890-879.
Jehoshaphat.....	876-852.	Ahab.....878-857.
Jehoram.....	851-844.	Ahaziah.....856-855.
Ahaziah.....	843.	Jehoram.....854-843.
Athaliah.....	842-837.	Jehu.....842-815.
Jehoash.....	836-797.	Jehoahaz.....814-798.
Amaziah.....	796-778.	Joash...797-782.
Uzziah.....	777-736.	Jeroboam II.....781-741.
Jotham (regent).....	750-736.	Zachariah.....741.
Jotham.....	735.	Menahem.....740-738.
		Pekahiah.....737-736.

Ahaz.....	734-715.	Pekah.....	736-730.
Hezekiah.....	714-686.	Hoshea.....	730-722.
Manasseh.....	685-641.		
Amon.....	640-639.		
Josiah.....	638-608.		
Jehoahaz.....	608.		
Jehoiakim.....	607-597.		
Jechonia.....	597.		
Zedekiah.....	596-586.		

This table assumes six errors in the Massoretic text, to wit: Amaziah's 29 years are to be reduced to 19, Uzziah's 52 to 42; Ahaz receives 20 instead of 16, Manasseh 45 for 55, Menahem 3 instead of 10, Pekah 6 instead of 20. When we consider how liable figures are to corruption in manuscript propagation, we shall not find this a large number, especially when we consider the hypotheses of other writers. Duncker, for example, in his *History of Antiquity* makes thirteen alterations. Others go so far (as already seen) as to make out that so far as chronology goes, we are in the Old Testament on entirely uncertain ground.

It is a matter for rejoicing that a cautious and at the same time impartial scholar has administered this decisive check to the hasty generalizations of the Wellhausen school. While all the suggestions of Kamphausen may not commend themselves to others (he himself asks that the sharpest scrutiny be given his work), it is yet certain that he has contributed to the final solution of the problem.

H. P. SMITH.

#### GUYOT'S CREATION.\*

This valuable little book is a result of the studies and research of a lifetime, by one who was at the same time an eminent scientist, a clear thinker, and a devout Christian. It is refreshing amid all the skepticism of the present day, even within the church itself, to see a statement so learned and so positive, of the perfect agreement between science and the Mosaic account of creation. Prof. Guyot says of the Bible-account: "By its sublime grandeur, by its symmetrical plan, by the profoundly philosophical disposition of its parts, and, perhaps, quite as much by its wonderful caution in the statement of facts, which leave room for all scientific discoveries, it betrays the Supreme guidance which directed the pen of the writer and kept it throughout within the limits of truth." Thus the first three days are believed to refer to the "era of matter," and the last three days to the "era of life." First we have creation of the material substructure, then the vegetable kingdom from the lower to the higher orders of plants, then the animal kingdom from the lower orders of the marine fauna to the higher orders of mammals, and finally man who is the introduction of a spiritual kingdom. This arrangement is philosophical and agrees perfectly with the well established leading facts of geology. Even in smaller details there are marked correspondences. The progress from the lower to the higher is not by natural evolution but by creation. **בְּרָא** is used

\* CREATION, OR THE BIBLICAL COSMOGONY IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN SCIENCE. By *Arnold Guyot, LL. D.*, Blair Professor of Geology in the College of New Jersey. Author of "Earth and Man." Member of the National Academy of Sciences of America. Associate member of the Royal Academy of Turin, etc., etc. New York: *Chas. Scribner's Sons*. Chicago: *W. S. M. Silber-*  
*agent*. Pp. 136. Price \$1.50.